

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AMAT/5908/CPV/ALUMINUM/PJS

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated December 14, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 14, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-64 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-64 are rejected. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Applicants propose canceling claims 1-54. Applicants propose amending claims 55 and 61 to more clearly illustrate the claimed subject matter. Applicants submit that the changes proposed herein reduce the issues for appeal and do not introduce new matter.

Claims 55, 57-58, 60-61, and 63-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *White et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,230). Applicants propose amending claim 55 to specify that the first and second chambers each enclose a robot. Applicants respectfully submit that *White et al.* does not show or describe first and second chambers each enclosing a robot in combination with two or more transition chambers that separate the first and second chambers.

Thus, *White, et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest a semiconductor wafer processing system, comprising a first chamber and a second chamber respectively enclosing a first robot and a second robot, the first and second chambers each having one or more processing chambers attached thereto, a load lock comprising a heating element and attached to the first chamber, and two or more transition chambers which separate the first and second chambers, the transition chambers each comprising a heating element disposed therein, as recited in proposed claim 55. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 55 and of claims 57, 58, and 60, which depend thereon.

Regarding claim 61, Applicants submit that *White et al.* does not teach or suggest that the substrate processing system described therein includes two robots enclosed in one chamber.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AMAT/5908/CPI/ALUMINUM/PJS

Thus, *White, et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest a semiconductor wafer processing system, comprising a chamber enclosing first and second robots and having one or more processing chambers attached thereto, a load lock comprising a heating element, the load lock being attached to the chamber, and two or more transition chambers within the chamber, each transition chamber comprising a heating element disposed therein, as recited in proposed claim 61. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 61 and of claims 63-64, which depend thereon.

Claims 1-54, 56, 59, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *White, et al.* in view of *Stevens et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,375,746). Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-54 is moot as Applicants propose canceling claims 1-54. Regarding claims 56 and 59, Applicants submit that *White, et al.* does not provide all of the limitations of claims 56 and 59, as claims 56 and 59 include the limitations of claim 55 as amended. As discussed above, *White, et al.* does not provide or suggest all of the limitations of claim 55. Regarding claim 62, Applicants submit that *White, et al.* does not provide all of the limitations of claim 62, as claim 62 includes the limitations of claim 61 as amended. As discussed above, *White, et al.* does not provide or suggest all of the limitations of claim 61.

Applicants further submit that *Stevens et al.*, individually or in combination with *White, et al.* does not provide all of the limitations of claims 55 and 61 as amended. *Stevens et al.* shows and describes processing systems including one robot enclosed by a transfer chamber and one or more atmospheric robots for loading substrates into the system. Regarding claims 56 and 59, *Stevens et al.* does not show or suggest two chambers respectively enclosing a first robot and a second robot, with each of the two chambers having one or more processing chambers attached thereto. As neither *White, et al.* nor *Stevens et al.* provides or suggests two chambers respectively enclosing a first robot and a second robot, with each of the two chambers having one or more processing chambers attached thereto, *White, et al.* and *Stevens et al.*, individually or in combination do not provide all of the limitations of claim 55 and of claims 56 and 59, which depend thereon. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 56 and 59.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AMAT/5908/CPI/ALUMINUM/PJS

Regarding claim 61, Applicant submits that *Stevens et al.* does not show or suggest one chamber enclosing two robots. As neither *White, et al.* nor *Stevens et al.* provides or suggests one chamber enclosing two robots, *White, et al.* and *Stevens et al.*, individually or in combination do not provide all of the limitations of claim 61 and of claim 62, which depends thereon. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 62.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)